

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully traverses and requests reconsideration. Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for the notice that claim 29 is allowed, and that claim 20 is “objected to”. Claim 30 is currently amended herein. No new matter has been added.

In item 9 on page 4 of the Office Action, claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Taylor (U.S. Pat. No. 6,118,461) in view of Gonsalves et al (U.S. Pat. No.; hereinafter: “Gonsalves”).

Claim 19 recites, among other novel features, “generating a second signal at a second device ... wherein the **second signal corresponds to an alternating frame of video**”. (Emphasis Added). It is respectfully submitted that Taylor and Gonsalves, either singly or in combination, fail to disclose, teach or suggest these features.

The Office Action alleges that “Taylor teaches 2nd rendered frame is output immediately after 1st rendered frame has been output, and thus teaches 2nd signal corresponds to alternating frame of video”. (See, last two sentences on page 4 through first line on page 5 of the Office Action). It is respectfully observed that the Office Action fails to pinpoint which section of Taylor purports to teach this feature. Moreover, the arguments presented in item 6 on page 3 of the Office Action (in the “Response to Argument” section) demonstrates ways in which Taylor’s system **sequentially maps the subsystems in a given chain** in order to completely map through each of the display units 103 and the system memory system 108 instead of “generating a second signal at a second device ... wherein the **second signal corresponds to an alternating frame of video**”, as recited by Applicant in claim 19.

That is, Taylor is directed to display mapping circuits, systems and methods wherein, among other things, each display control unit of a plurality of control units is assigned the

responsibility for controlling display data of a respective region of a single screen of a display device. See e.g., FIG. 2A & column 5, lines 14-17 of Taylor. For example, in FIG. 2A of Taylor's system 100, **a single display 110 is divided into twelve (12) non-overlapping regions** corresponding to, in this case, twelve display units (subsystems) 103. See also, FIG. 2A & column 5, lines 17-21 of Taylor. That is, the Taylor system is a sub-frame based system that divides a single frame into subsections for each display control unit 103. In column 6, lines 29-38, Taylor discloses mapping procedures wherein master 101 presents a predetermined reference address on bus 102, and then, selected reference address bits are latched into the prefix register of bus interface 106 of display unit 103a. Master 101 then starts incrementing from the reference address to generate a sequence of addresses on bus 102. The sequence continues until the end of the address space of unit 103a is reached. See also, column 6, lines 29-38 of Taylor.

Taylor further discloses that such mapping procedure described above continues in a similar fashion until all the subsystems 103/108 have been mapped i.e., until a prefix value uniquely identifying each subsystem 103/108 has been stored in the registers of the corresponding bus interface 106. See, column 7, lines 31-35 of Taylor. Taylor also discloses that **the mapping proceeds through each of the display units 103 and the system memory system 108**. See, column 7, lines 35-37 of Taylor. At the conclusion of the mapping of the last subsystem in the chain (e.g. system memory system 108), the MAP OUT port of that subsystem goes active thereby signaling master 101 that mapping is complete. See, column 7, lines 37-41 of Taylor. Indeed, Taylor describes using a subframe system, and as such, an adjacent frame can not be an alternating frame of video as set forth in claim 19. Thus, **Taylor's** approach will present difficulties to a user who desires to generate a second signal at a second device wherein **the second signal corresponds to an alternating frame of video** in that Taylor's approach

sequentially maps the subsystems in a given chain in order to completely map through each of the display units 103 and the system memory system 108.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that Taylor fails to disclose, teach or suggest “generating a second signal at a second device ... wherein the **second signal corresponds to an alternating frame of video**”, as recited by Applicant in claim 19. Moreover, Gonsalves fails to cure the deficiencies found in Taylor. Instead, Gonsalves merely discloses a method to generate a representation of a color modification to be applied to segments on a digital nonlinear editing system, where each segment is a component of a media composition, and represents a section of a digital media. See e.g., column 2, lines 63-65. Applicant also respectfully submits that the cited references do not teach adjusting the second device until a value of the second signal at the first output node substantially matches the determined value of the first signal at the first output node, as recited by Applicant in claim 19. In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection is overcome.

Applicant further notes that independent claim 30 as amended above includes substantially similar limitations to those described in allowed claim 29. More specifically, claim 30 is amended to clarify the feature of “a common port operatively coupled to the first graphics device and the second graphics device, the common port being operative to receive the first and second frames of rendered video from either of the first and second graphics devices”. No new matter has been added. Also, based on the Examiner’s comments in the “Response to Arguments” section in item 4 on pages 2-3 of the current Office Action, it is respectfully submitted that claim 30 should be allowed.

Dependent claims 20-22 and 31-39 each ultimately depend on claims 19 and 30 and are allowable for at least similar reasons. In addition, these claims add additional novel and non-

obvious subject matter. For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 19 and 30 along with dependent claims 20-22 and 31-39 define patentable subject matter.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. The Examiner is invited to contact the below listed attorney if the Examiner believes that a telephone conference will advance the prosecution of this application.

Date: September 15, 2008

Vedder Price P.C.
222 N. LaSalle Street
Chicago, Illinois 60601
PHONE: (312) 609-7599
FAX: (312) 609-5005

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

Uchendu O. Anyaso
Registration No.: 51,411